	STATE DAD OF CALIFORNIA				
	STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL	PUBLIC MATTER			
2					
3		Especies E Representa Seguera			
4	arra				
5		NOV 2 7 2017			
6	ERICA L. M. DENNINGS, No. 145755	TO AME A LAME B WANTER HE			
7		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO			
8	San Francisco, California 94105-1639 Telephone: (415) 538-2285				
9					
10	STATE BAR COURT				
11	HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO				
12		ě.			
13	In the Matter of:) Case No. 17-O-1124			
14	GILBERT WHITNEY LEIGH,) NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES			
15	No. 153457,				
16	A Member of the State Bar	<u>}</u> ,			
17	NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!				
18	IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRI	IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE			
19	WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL:				
20	(1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENTERED;				
21	 (2) YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED TO INACTIVE AND YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW; (3) YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOU MAKE A TIMELY MOTION AND THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND; (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE. SPECIFICALLY, IF YOU FAIL TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET ASIDE OR VACATE YOUR DEFAULT, THIS COURT WILL ENTER AN 				
22					
23					
24					
25	FURTHER HEARING OR PROCEEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET SEO				
26	RULES OF PROCEDURE OF T	HE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.			
27	/// ,,,	kwiktag⊛ 226 154 673			
11					

-1-

28

The State Bar of California alleges:

JURISDICTION

1. Gilbert Whitney Leigh ("respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on June 14, 2001, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.

COUNT ONE

Case No. 17-O-1124
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
[Failure to Perform with Competence]

2. In on or about April 2014, Peter Trepp employed respondent to perform legal services, namely to pursue a breach of contract action against two companies. After filing a lawsuit against the companies, *Peter Trepp v. Inktank Storage, Inc. and Red Hat, Inc.*, et al United States District Court Central District case number CV 15-02008-AB-AGR, respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform with competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by failing to oppose defendant Inktank Storage's motion to dismiss, and failing to respond to the Court's Order to Show Cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute Red Hat, Inc., resulting in the case being dismissed with prejudice.

COUNT TWO

Case No. 17-O-1124
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
[Failure to Inform Client of Significant Developments]

3. Respondent failed to keep respondent's client, Peter Trepp, reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m), by failing to inform the client of the following:

27 11///

	4
	()
	4
	5
	6
,	7
	8
9)
10)
11	
12)
13	Ĺ
14	.5
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	200
23	
24	
25	
26	-
27	-
	1

28

- A) On or about May 1, 2015, defendant Inktank filed a motion to dismiss in the *Trepp v. Inktank, Inc.* case;
- B) On or about May 19, 2015, the court issued an Order to Show Cause requiring respondent to show why the case *Trepp v. Inktank, Inc.* should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute;
- C) Respondent did not file an opposition to the motion to dismiss or a response to the Order to Show Cause; and
- D) On or about May 27, 2015, the court granted the motion to dismiss and the case was dismissed with prejudice.

COUNT THREE

Case No. 17-O-1124
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

4. Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against respondent by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar's letters of March 16, 2017 and April 11, 2017 which respondent received, that requested respondent's response to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 17-O-1124, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!

YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT.

NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!

IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING

AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

DATED: November 27, 2017

By: (//// Erica L. M. Dennings Senior Trial Counsel

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL / U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL / OVERNIGHT DELIVERY / FACSIMILE-ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

CASE NUMBER(s): 17-O-1124

I, the undersigned, am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within action, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, California 94105, declare that:

- on the date shown below, I caused to be served a true copy of the within document described as follows:

	The second to be served at the copy of the within doc					
on the state of th	NOTICE OF DISCI	PLINARY CHARGES				
By U.S. First-Class M - in accordance with the - of San Francisco.	ail: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) practice of the State Bar of California for collection and	By U.S. Certified processing of mail, I deposited or pla	Mail: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) aced for collection and mailing in the City and County			
By Overnight Delivery: (CCP §§ 1013(c) and 1013(d)) - I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery by the United Parcel Service ('UPS')						
By Fax Transmission: (CCP §§ 1013(e) and 1013(f)) Based on agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed herein below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. The original record of the fax transmission is retained on file and available upon request.						
By Electronic Service: (CCP § 1010.6) Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the person(s) at the electronic addresses listed herein below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was						
(for U.S. First-Class Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing at San Francisco, addressed to: (see below)						
(for Certified Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as certified mail, return receipt requested, Article No.: 9414 7266 9904 2112 6627 37 at San Francisco, addressed to: (see below)						
(for Overnight Delivery) Tracking No.:	ogether with a copy of this declaration, in an env	elope, or package designated by	•			
Person Served	Business-Residential Address	Fax Number	Courtesy Copy to Respondent's Counsel:via email:			
Doron Weinberg, Counsel for Respondent	Doron Weinberg 523 Octavia St San Francisco, CA 94102-4313	Electronic Address doronweinberg@aol.com	doronweinberg@aol.com			
	processed and maintained by the State Bar o	of California addressed to:				
v	NA					
I am readily familiar with the overnight delivery by the United Parce California would be deposited with the day.	State Bar of California's practice for collection and proc I Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Bi United States Postal Service that same day, and for or	essing of correspondence for mailing ar of California's practice, corresponde remight delivery, deposited with deliver	with the United States Postal Service, and ence collected and processed by the State Bar of ery fees paid or provided for, with UPS that same			
I am aware that on motion of after date of deposit for mailing contain	the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal c and in the affidavit.	ancellation date or postage meter dat	e on the envelope or package is more than one day			
I declare under penalty of California, on the date shown belov	perjury, under the laws of the State of California,	that the foregoing is true and com	rect. Executed at San Francisco,			
		ED: Meagan McGowan				
Declarant						